



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,379	09/25/2003	Thomas K. McDonald	BEAER:65632	1868

24201 7590 11/01/2005

FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6060 CENTER DRIVE
TENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER

PATEL, MITAL B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3743

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/671,379	Applicant(s) MCDONALD ET AL.	
	Examiner Mital B. Patel	Art Unit 3743	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/7/05 has been entered.

Response to Arguments/Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments filed 7/29/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. In response to applicant's argument that the mask 10 of Shoemaker et al. is storage," the Examiner capable of deflecting to conform to a wearer's face and for strongly disagrees. First, recitations of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re 0110*, 312 F.2d 937, 939, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). Specifically, the mask 10 is fully capable of deflecting to conform to a wearer's face and for storage."

Art Unit: 3743

Applicant has claimed to what degree the mask must be folded in order to be considered in a "storage" position, thus, the prior art of record meets the claim limitation since the mask 10 must only be capable of being deflected into a "storage" position, which could be any position or orientation in which the mask is ever so slightly deflected. Shoemaker et al. also offers support for the limitation of deflecting to conform to a wearer's face" in column 4, lines 25-42. Shoemaker et al. states, Mask 10 is molded of a transparent silicone elastomer in a thickness sufficient to make it semi-rigid but still thin enough to permit visor 18 to deflect sufficiently under urging..." The term 'semi-rigid' means that the mask 10 has the capability of being flexed to some degree. As such the Examiner concludes that the mask is also capable of being rolled into storage.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 22-29 and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(102) as being anticipated by Shoemaker et al (US 4,595,003).

5. Regarding claims 22, 23, 26-29, 31, 32 and 34, Shoemaker et al. discloses a quick-donning full face oxygen mask 10 including a flexible mask assembly 12 having a flexible periphery 16 conformable to wearer's face and a flexible optical lens 18 of

Art Unit: 3743

optical quality disposed in the flexible mask assembly 12, which allows a wide field of view to the wearer as shown in Figure 1. The mask 10, and its components, are "molded of a transparent silicone elastomer" such as silicone elastomer X4-2665, made by Dow Corning" (column 4, lines 25-42). Regarding claims 24, 25 and 33, the flexible optical lens 18 is "coated on both sides with urethane from a solvent bath to improve the abrasion resistance of the mask" (column 4, line 67 through column 5, line 16).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoemaker et al. (US 4,595,003), as applied to claims 22-29 and 31-34 above, in view of Aulgur et al. (US 4,915, 106) or Dubruille et al. (US 5,630,412). Shoemaker et al discloses a quick-donning full face oxygen mask 10 comprising all the limitations recite in claim 30, with the exception of an inflatable harness formed of silicone tubing. However, the use of an inflatable harness formed of silicone tubing was known at the time the invention was made. Specifically, Aulgur et al. or Dubruille et al. teaches the use of "a harness strap which can be inflated to a somewhat rigid, self-sustaining orientation to permit one-handed placement of the respirator over the wearer's head" ('106, Abstract) or a "harness...capable of pressing the mask against the face with sufficient force to prevent

Art Unit: 3743

leaks" ('412, column 1, lines 22-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the mask of Shoemaker et al. by adding an inflatable harness formed of silicone tubing because it is well known in the art, as taught by Aulgur et al. or Dubruille et al., to utilize an inflatable harness in order to secure a breathing apparatus snugly, yet comfortably, to the wearer's head.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mital B. Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-4802. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (11:00-7:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Henry Bennett can be reached on 571-272-4791. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Mital B. Patel
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3743

Application/Control Number: 10/671,379
Art Unit: 3743

Page 6